REMARKS

1. Examiner rejected claims 3-5 and 18-20 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as not being enabled.

2. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner assertion that the subject matter of claims 3-5 and 18-20 were not enabled in the original disclosure. Page 3, lines 30-33 state that "[t]he drive opening may be any desired or functional shape . . ." The statement would include the plurality of ridges used for the connections used between the sockets and the extension shown elsewhere in this application. The claims, which recite the plurality of ridges, form a portion of the original disclosure. Someone skilled in the art would have no problem forming the claimed driver having a multiplicity of ridges with the example of the connection shown for the socket/extension connection and the disclosure.

   Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3-5 and 18-20 are enabled as required by 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw this rejection.

3. Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6-9 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by McNeeley.

4. Examiner rejected claims 2 and 10-14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeeley.

5. Claim 1 is novel and nonobvious over McNeeley by recitation of the following feature:

   "said extension collar having a length greater than a length of said socket, said length of said extension collar being formed of a single tubular body"

   In McNeeley, all of the sockets are the same size. The extension of the socket is provided by the other sockets. It is only with the use of multiple sockets that any length may be developed. However, with the multiple connections comes instability. Each connection has some play, with several sockets this creates an undesirable instability. In use, the type of device found in McNeeley is both heavy and wobbly to the point of making it difficult to get the socket to engage a nut.

In Applicant's claimed configuration, a longer extension collar is used. This allows the user to have a long extension collar without the need for a large number of separate pieces. Reducing the number of connections significantly reduces the amount of instability of the overall device. The stability of the connections is further enhanced by the multiplicity of ridges, which will be discussed further with respect to claims 12 and 13. Further since the collar is used for force transmission and does not need to also function as various sockets, the collar may be formed with much less material and is therefore comparatively lightweight, while having improved force transmission and stability characteristics.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is novel and nonobvious over McNeeley. Allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

6. Claims 2 and 6-14, being dependent on claim 1, should also be in allowable form. Allowance of these claims is also respectfully requested.

7. Further claims 12 and 13 are novel and nonobvious over McNeeley in their own right by recitation of the following features:

> "wherein said first and second multiplicities of ridges each contain between twenty and forty ridges" (claim 12)
>
> "wherein said first and second multiplicities of ridges each contain 32 ridges" (claim 13)

McNeeley neither discloses nor suggests using these quantities of ridges. Further, Examiner has not indicated anything in McNeeley that would make the use of this feature obvious.

McNeeley uses four equally spaced torque keys and matching keyways to transmit the force. As stated in Applicant's specification on page 5, lines 19-30, there are benefits to using the

larger numbers of ridges. One of the benefits is that the larger number of ridges increases the gripping surface. In McNeeley, where you are using a large stack of sockets, even a small amount of play in each connection would severely compromise the stability and force transmission capability as discussed above. Therefore, the smaller number of torque keys is suitable for the expected usage of the device.

However, Applicant's device is constructed to transmit much higher torque. The robust usage requires better torque transmission and stability. One of the features that allows the device to function under these conditions is a very stable connection between the socket and the extension collar. The number of ridges provides the torque transmission characteristics desired, while still allowing for the large inner passageway.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 13 are novel and nonobvious over the prior art. Allowance of claims 12 and 13 is respectfully requested.

8. Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeeley in view of Hardin and Rohm.

9. Claim 15 is novel and nonobvious over the references cited by recitation of the following feature:

> "said extension collar having a length greater than a length of said tool attachment, said length of said extension collar being formed of a single tubular body"

As stated above with respect to claim 1, McNeeley neither discloses nor suggests these features. Hardin is drawn to a helical drill bit and does not disclose an extension collar. Rohm is drawn to an adjustable drill chuck and does not disclose an extension collar.

Therefore the combination of these references would not make obvious claim 15. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 15.

10. Claims 16 and 17, being dependent on claim 15, should also be in allowable form. Allowance of these claims is also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, Applicant submits that the claims all define novel subject matter that is nonobvious. Therefore, allowance of these claims is submitted to be proper and is respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

Carol D. Titus
GSS Law Group
3900 Newpark Mall Rd
Third Floor, Suite 317
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 38,436
Phone (510) 742-7417
Fax (510) 742-7419

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Signature _____ Date: October 5, 2005
Carol D. Titus